

THE GENERAL BOARD

United States Forces, European Theater

CIVIL AFFAIRS AND MILITARY GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

IN CONNECTION WITH

MONUMENTS, FINE ARTS, AND ARCHIVES

MISSION: Prepare Report and Recommendations on Civil Affairs
and Military Government Activities in Connection
with Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives.

"The General Board was established by General Order 123, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, US Army, dated 17 June 1945, as amended by General Order 182, dated 7 August 1945 and General Order 312, dated 20 November 1945, Headquarters United States Forces, European Theater, to prepare a factual analysis of the strategy, tactics, and administration employed by the United States Forces in the European Theater.

File: 000.4/1

Study Number 36

Property of
Office of the Chief
Military History
General Reference Branch

THE GENERAL BOARD
UNITED STATES FORCES, EUROPEAN THEATER
APO 408

CIVIL AFFAIRS AND MILITARY GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES
IN CONNECTION WITH
MONUMENTS, FINE ARTS, AND ARCHIVES

Prepared by:

Brigadier General C. E. Ryan, GSC

Chief, G-5 Section

Colonel Walker R. Goodrich, GSC

G-5 Section

Captain Everett P. Lesley, Jr., QMC

G-5 Section

Principal consultants:

Colonel Henry C. Newton, INF, O-104029, Director,
Ministerial Collecting Center, Office of Military
Government for Germany, Furstenhagen, Germany
(APO 742, US Army).

Major Louis B. LaFarge, AC, O-905778, Chief, Monuments,
Fine Arts, and Archives Branch, Reparations,
Deliveries, and Restitutions Division, Office of
Military Government for Germany, APO 757 (Main),
US Army.

Captain Walker K. Hancock, INF, O-513319, Military
Government Detachment G-39, 2d Military Government
Regiment, APO 758, US Army.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
<u>Part One:</u> Planning, Policy, and Personnel	1
Chapter 1: Plans and Policies Established by Civilian and Military Agencies	1
Section 1 - Civilian Agencies	1
American Defense - Harvard Group	1
American Council of Learned Societies	1
Frick Art Reference Library	2
American Commission	2
Section 2 - Military Agencies	3
Civil Affairs Division	3
Section 3 - Planning by SHAEF	5
Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Policy	11
Special Planning Regarding Archives	13
The Official Lists	14
Chapter 2: Personnel Procurement and Deployment	15
Section 1 - Procurement	15
The Roberts Commission	15
European Civil Affairs Division	15
Commissioning of Enlisted Personnel	15
Section 2 - Deployment	16
European Civil Affairs Division	16
Assignments to Armies and Army Groups	16
Bibliography	17
<u>Part Two:</u> Major Problems Encountered	21
Chapter 1: Administrative, Technical, and Supply Problems	21
Section 1 - Administrative Problems	21
Channels of Communication	21
Staff Status and Command Authority	21
Section 2 - Technical Problems	23
Field Reports	23
Extent of Areas Covered	25
Emergency Protective Materials	26
Protection and Evacuation of Depositories	26
Protection of Archives	28
Section 3 - Supply and Security Problems	30
Transportation	30
Photographic Equipment	30
Information, Publications, and Intelligence	30
Posting of Notices	31

Chapter 2: Application of Policy to Field Operations. . . 31

Section 1 - Conflicts of Policy 31

Billeting and Supervision of Troops. 31

Restitution. 33

Section 2 - The Official Lists and Their

Disadvantages 34

Restrictive Character, 34

Counteractive Measures 34

Bibliography. 36

Part Three: Conclusions and Recommendations. 40

Chapter 1: Conclusions. 40

Planning by Civilian Agencies. 40

Planning by Military Agencies. 40

Policy 40

Personnel Procurement and Deployment 41

Staff Procedure and Organization 41

Supply 41

The Official Lists 41

Communication. 42

General. 42

Chapter 2: Recommendations. , 43

Policy 43

Lists of Monuments 43

Assignment of Responsibilities 43

Archives 43

Future MEAA Organization , 43

THE GENERAL BOARD
UNITED STATES FORCES, EUROPEAN THEATER
APO 408

REPORT ON CIVIL AFFAIRS AND MILITARY GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES
IN CONNECTION WITH MONUMENTS, FINE ARTS AND ARCHIVES

PART ONE

PLANNING, POLICY, AND PERSONNEL

CHAPTER 1

PLANS AND POLICIES ESTABLISHED BY CIVILIAN

AND MILITARY AGENCIES

SECTION 1

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

1. American Defense - Harvard Group. On 6 January 1943, the American Defense-Harvard Group interested itself in the protection of works of art and historic monuments in theaters of war and occupied territory.¹ Correspondence with the Provost Marshal General's Office led to a request by that office that the Harvard Group undertake to prepare appropriate materials. The Harvard Group took the initiative in preparing lists of monuments, sent them to the Provost Marshal General's Office, and revised them in the light of suggestions received.

2. The American Council of Learned Societies.

a. On 15 March 1943, Professor William Bell Dinsmoor of Columbia University, writing² to the Secretary of War, enclosed a Memorandum relative to the military steps to be taken for the protection and salvage of artistic and historic monuments in Europe. This Memorandum had been prepared and signed by Francis Henry Taylor, Director of the Metropolitan Museum, New York City. Mr. Taylor pointed out that measures should be undertaken by the War Department, which, if not in conflict with military strategy, would contribute to the salvage of whatever possible of European civilization. The Secretary of War forwarded both these documents to the Director of the School of Military Government (SMG) at Charlottesville, Virginia.

b. On 7 April 1943,⁴ Professor Dinsmoor wrote to the Director, SMG, that it was necessary immediately to utilize experience already accumulated by civilian agencies. Appended to Professor Dinsmoor's letter of 7 April 1943, was an "Outline of Preliminary Processes", which might be undertaken at once by a committee of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). These were: compilation of a roster of competent individuals in the armed forces; preparation of a card catalogue of cultural monuments, museums, and private collections; preparation of lists and locations of "inventories of inventories", and a series of city and town maps with the locations of important monuments and

collections plainly marked; information on European museum personnel; compilation of information regarding the confiscation, forced sale, or destruction of material in Europe; preparation of brief general directions for the salvage and protection of works of art; and preparation of directions for treatment of isolated monuments or chance discoveries.

c. The ACLS committee formed in March 1943, shortly became the "Committee of the ACLS on the Preservation of European Cultural Material". The committee sent out to interested scholars a statement of its aims, and a questionnaire enlisting their assistance, which were forwarded to the Secretary of War, 11 May 1943.⁵ On 18 June 1945, the committee was granted the sum of \$16,500 by the Rockefeller Foundation of New York City for the prosecution of its work. On 25 June 1943, the committee, now called the "Committee on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas", had its first full meeting⁶ in New York City.

d. The activities of this committee for the next year may be summarized as follows:

- (1) Maps marked with the locations of cultural monuments in regions and towns of continental Europe were assembled and published in the form of atlases by the Army.
- (2) Civil Affairs Handbooks, (Section 17, on Cultural Institutions), were prepared by the Army with the committee's assistance.
- (3) A file of information on looted cultural objects was compiled.

3. The Frick Art Reference Library. On 15 June 1945, Miss Helen Clay Frick invited the members of the ACLS Committee to utilize the facilities and staff of the Frick Art Reference Library,⁸ which were then concentrated on the production of the cultural maps and atlases.

4. The American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas (The "Roberts Commission").

a. On 8 December 1942, the Honorable Harlan F. Stone addressed a letter to the President concerning the creation of an organization to function under the auspices of the Government for the protection and conservation of works of art and of artistic or historic monuments and records in Europe.

b. On 20 April 1945, the President was again approached.⁹ By this time the matter had been given consideration by the Department of State; the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics also had been approached relative to a similar organization. It was deemed appropriate to appoint a commission to be known as "The American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe", such commission to advise and work with the S.M.C. Personnel for the commission was suggested.

c. On 20 August 1943, the President approved the estab-

lishment of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe,¹⁰ with the Honorable Owen J. Roberts, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, as Chairman. The Commission was to function under the auspices of the United States Government and in conjunction with similar groups in other countries for the protection and conservation of works of art and of artistic and historic records in Europe. The Commission was to cooperate with the appropriate branches of the Army and of the Department of State, including the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations, and would also advise and work with the SMG at Charlottesville, Virginia. The principal functions of the Commission would be to:

- (1) Act as a channel of communication between the Army and the various universities, museums and individuals from whom information and services were desired.
- (2) Furnish museum officials and art historians to the General Staff of the Army.
- (3) Compile lists of property appropriated by the Axis.

SECTION 2

MILITARY AGENCIES

5. Civil Affairs Division, Office of the Chief of Staff.

a. On 1 April 1943, the Director, SMG, Charlottesville, Virginia, in a Memorandum to the Acting Director, Civil Affairs Division (CAD),¹¹ stated that special measures would be required in occupied territory for the protection and preservation of historical monuments and art treasures.

b. The memorandum recommended that:

- (1) Four or five carefully selected experts be commissioned for the purpose of taking the course at the SMG.
- (2) The Civil Affairs Section of each theater commander include one or two such experts to advise in the matter of protecting historical monuments.
- (3) Experts be included in the pool of technicians and specialists being formed by the Provost Marshal General.
- (4) Field Manual 27-5 be amended or supplemented by appropriate reference to the subject.

c. On 19 April 1943, it was agreed¹² that the CAD would be furnished a comprehensive list of qualified officers for duty in connection with this work, and a further list of qualified personnel not at the time in the military service.

d. In a Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of War,

21 July 1943,¹³ the Chief, G-3, outlined the steps to be taken up to that time.

- (1) The Directive for HUSKY (the Sicilian invasion) made reference to the preservation of historic monuments.
- (2) General Eisenhower had agreed to the addition of two staff advisors on the preservation of historical and art treasures.
- (3) The cultural material so far prepared by the ACLS Committee had been furnished to General Eisenhower.

e. On 26 October 1943, a Memorandum for the Chief, G-3,¹⁴ outlined the action taken to preserve artistic treasures in territory where military operations were undertaken.

- (1) Determination of Policy. The War Department had adopted the policy of protecting artistic treasures to the fullest extent consistent with military operations.
- (2) Formulation of Plans.
 - (a) Directives for military operations issued by the Combined Chiefs of Staff provided that, so far as consistent with military necessity, all efforts should be made to preserve local archives, historic and classical monuments and objects of art.
 - (b) In the Mediterranean Theater of Operations detailed instructions had been issued.
- (3) Procurement of Personnel. Provision was made in tables of organization of Allied Military Government (AMG) for museums and monuments officers recommended by the ACLS Committee and the Roberts Commission.
- (4) Distribution of Maps. Four copies of each cultural map prepared by the CLS Committee were distributed to the theater of operations by the Provost Marshal General; one was retained for possible duplication in handbooks.

f. The memorandum recommended that:

- (1) Civil Affairs directives should contain a clause to the effect that consistent with the success and security of military operations appropriate precautions would be taken to protect records, library holdings, museum collections, and works of art.
- (2) The percentage of monuments personnel should be substantially increased.

- (3) The Roberts Commission should be requested to collect information, prepare plans, and recommend measures for locating storage places to which works of art and historic documents had been removed from museums in enemy-occupied territory.
- (4) The State Department should be informed of the action being taken by the Army, and should be asked for a report of detailed measures being taken by the agencies of other United Nations.

g. In April 1944, Colonel Henry C. Newton became a member of the CID. Colonel Newton's primary task was to set up an organization and Standing Operating Procedure (SOP) by means of which the civilian planning already undertaken could be put into effect. Writing on 20 April 1944 to Professor Geoffrey Webb,¹⁵ Colonel Newton envisaged a selection of competent personnel sufficiently large in number to cover all aspects of the anticipated Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives (MFAA) problem. This personnel Colonel Newton categorized as: tactically trained officers; officers with engineering or construction experience; specialists in rehabilitation of objects of art; and officers with museum and record experience. Colonel Newton also suggested a constant flow of reports and information back to the War Department and the Roberts Commission from the theater. Monthly reports would be made by the principal staff officers in each sub-section, and occupancy reports would be made immediately upon the occupancy of an area by either US or other Allied troops. Colonel Newton's very comprehensive plan had, however, been anticipated to a certain extent by the activities already under way at SHAEF.

SECTION 3

PLANNING BY SUPREME HEADQUARTERS, ALLIED EXPEDITIONARY FORCE

6. As early as 25 June 1943, British officers were concerned with the military protection of artistic/historic monuments. A memorandum¹⁶ was submitted to the First Secretary of the US Embassy in London, suggesting that precautions, orders to troops, publicity, detail of guards and prescription of disciplinary measures, consultation of local authorities and appointment of special officers should be undertaken.

7. In November 1943, when the Civil Affairs Section of Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives was established at Headquarters Chief of Staff, Supreme Allied Commander (COSAC),¹⁷ the duties of the section were to:

a. Record and assess war damage suffered by historic monuments prior to our occupation; take or advise the steps necessary to prevent further deterioration; supervise and pass estimates for repairs.

b. Prevent damage by troops; affix notices, close buildings or procure guards; check billeting; interest the troops by lectures or otherwise; and investigate charges of wanton damage brought against the Allied troops and report proved cases.

c. Prevent the looting, sale or removal of objects of art.

d. Establish the fact of looting by enemy troops.

The Director of the section (British) was to operate from GHQ, together with one Deputy Director (US). He was to have a pool of officers, and assign these officers to different areas.

8. On 20 December 1943, the Commander in Chief AMHQ, issued to all commanders a letter ¹⁸ on historical monuments which was to be the basis upon which further MFA policies were enunciated. The text of the letter in part follows:

"Today we are fighting in a country which has contributed a great deal to our cultural inheritance, a country rich in monuments which by their creation helped and now in their old age illustrate the growth of the civilization which is ours. We are bound to respect those monuments so far as war allows.

If we have to choose between destroying a famous building and sacrificing our own men, then our men's lives count infinitely more and the buildings must go Nothing can stand against the argument of military necessity ... But the phrase "military necessity" is sometimes used where it would be more truthful to speak of military convenience or even of personal convenience. I do not want it to cloak slackness or indifference.

It is a responsibility of higher commanders to determine through AMG Officers the locations of historical monuments whether they be immediately ahead of our front lines or in areas occupied by us. This information passed to lower echelons through normal channels places the responsibility on all commanders of complying with the spirit of this letter."

9. The letter was accompanied by General Order No. 68, "Historical Monuments", 29 December 1943. This General Order provided that:

a. No building listed in the sections "Works of Art" in the "Zone Hand-Books" of Italy was to be used for military purposes without the explicit permission of the Allied Commander-in-Chief or of the Commander-in-Chief, 15 Army Group, in each individual case.

b. Commanders were authorized to close and put "Off Limits" any of the buildings listed in the AMG "Zone Hand-Book". Notices were to be affixed and guards provided if necessary.

c. Allied Military Government Officers were prepared to furnish commanders with a list of historic buildings which might be used for military purposes when deemed necessary.

d. The prevention of looting, wanton damage and sacrilege of buildings was a command responsibility.

10. As originally proposed²⁰ in January 1944, the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section, G.I.D., H.Q. S.I.C., was to consist of a Chief (BR) with the rank of Lt. Colonel, ²¹ who would be attached to H.Q. S.I.C., and two Deputy Chiefs, one British, one US, with rank of Major, who would be attached to the British and US Army Hqs respectively, and a staff consisting of British and US officers roughly in the proportion of 50% each.

a. The function of the section was to;

- (1) Protect historic monuments and works of art from avoidable loss or damage.
- (2) Take measures to prevent the further deterioration of historic buildings.
- (3) Collect evidence of German removal or wanton destruction of works of art with a view to restitution or compensation.

b. The officers of the M.F.A.A. section, on the occupation of any area by Allied troops were to;

- (1) Examine monuments in the area, report any damage, and initiate "first aid" measures.
- (2) Collaborate with the native authorities to establish the facts of the removal or wanton destruction of works of art by the Germans.
- (3) Report regularly directly to their sub-chief, who should in turn report to the chief of section. The chief of the section was to report to the Roberts Commission and to Civil Affairs Headquarters in London.

c. In consideration of the three-fold functions of the section, close liaison with combat forces was essential. It was proposed that one officer should be attached to headquarters of each army, and should have under him three officers with the frontline troops or in the area under the army command. The chief of the section was to have under him a mobile pool of eight officers whom he should distribute at his discretion.

d. The T/O & E, as originally contemplated, was as follows;

Chief (BR); 1 Lieutenant Colonel
Deputy Chiefs (US and BR); 2 Majors
Staff: (US) 3 Majors
(BR) 6 Majors
Enlisted: 3 M/GRs, Clerks; 3 M/GRs, Drivers
Totals: 17 officers,
6 enlisted

3 ea., Trucks, $\frac{1}{2}$ -ton, 4x4
1 ea., Truck, $\frac{3}{4}$ -ton, "C"
20 ea., Arms, small, with ammunition
6 ea., Cameras, Leica, 35 mm.
3 ea., Typewriters, portable

11. Civil Affairs Instruction No. 15, "Public Monuments and Fine Arts", for Operation OVERLORD, Rankin "C", 22 was issued by the Civil Affairs Division, SHAEF, 17 February 1944. This instruction stated that:

a. Civil Affairs staffs and detachments would operate in conformity with Standard Policy and Procedure, Paragraphs 51 and 117, Public Monuments and Fine Arts, and Paragraphs 52 and 118, Government Records and Archives, in the spirit of General Eisenhower's letter of 28 December 1943 to all commanders in the Mediterranean Theater.

b. It was the policy of the Allied Governments to prevent further deterioration of damaged buildings, and to safeguard works of art.

c. Civil Affairs staffs and detachments should have in mind the possibility of slanderous accusations against Allied troops. The work of the MEM Specialist Officer was essential in preventing damage which might be used for propaganda.

d. It was the duty of the Civil Affairs staffs and detachments to protect the Allied authorities from false claims.

e. Classified lists of monuments and repositories were to be issued as necessary.

f. Ordinance No. 11, the "Antiquities Ordinance", had been drafted and would be issued at an early date.

g. Detailed proposals for the composition of staffs to deal with this function had been drawn up.

h. Among instructions likely to be issued was a detailed appreciation of the problem of tracing and impounding looted works of art.

i. Subject to the establishment of the staff mentioned in (g) above, Civil Affairs staffs were instructed that;

- (1) Specialist officers at army group headquarters would inform subordinate units as areas or towns containing historic monuments and works of art came within their sphere.
- (2) Specialist officers at army group headquarters would contact Allied liaison officers to ensure that similar practice would be adopted by any Allied military forces.
- (3) Detachment commanders would be responsible for initiating demands for assistance from the specialist pool.
- (4) Detachment commanders would enlist the cooperation of local commanders to prevent damage, and secure the cooperation of local indigenous authorities.
- (5) Detachment commanders should report the condition and contents of local monuments at the earliest moment.

12. is finally organized, in G-5 Section, Supreme Headquarters, Operations Branch directed the operation and planning of MFM matters. The principal control headquarters, the Functional Group, was under the general direction of Professor (later Lt Colonel) Geoffrey Webb.²³ This headquarters controlled and directed all work of the MFM units and prepared policies, plans, orders, drafts and instructions for the execution of the work.²⁴

13. On 5 March 1944, a Memorandum to the LCOB, G-5, SHAEF,²⁵ outlined a preliminary plan for the organization and operation of MFM. Experience in Italy had proved that insufficient organization, training, and the lack of an SOP caused confusion and misunderstanding. The following suggestions were made to simplify pending operations:

a. Personnel: British and US participating must be balanced in numbers and rank.

b. Intelligence: On the MFM staff at SHAEF, the T/O should call for an MFM Intelligence Officer.

c. Operations: The relation of MFM Officers to the military staffs should be clarified.

d. Supplies: Previous to operational commitment all MFM Officers should be fully equipped with transportation, SOP instructions, guide books and maps, lists of monuments, posters, and standard report forms.

e. Training: MFM Officers should undergo preliminary military training in the fundamentals of their own field.

14. A Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives unit was activated in March 1944, in the Interior Sub-Section of the German Section, Special Staff, Civil Affairs, SHAEF (the "German Country Unit"). The MFM Section in the Functional Group (Refer Par 12) became the technical higher echelon for the MFM Branch of the German Country Unit. In the reorganization of the Civil Affairs Staff in May, the MFM Unit became the MFM Branch of the Interior Division, German Country Unit, under G-5 (Civil Affairs) Operations Branch of SHAEF. On 7 June 1944, the German Country Unit moved from the American School Center at Shrivenham, Berkshire, England to London. This move concluded the first planning stage of the activities of the MFM Branch.

a. Personnel of the MFM Branch of the German Country Unit were;

- (1) Major Theodore Sizer, LC (O-167115)
- (2) Capt Mason Hammond, LC (O-918013)
- (3) 2d Lt Calvin S. Hathaway, QIC (O-1591790)

b. Principal activities were;

- (1) Submission of estimates of personnel and other requirements.
- (2) Preparation and revision of a chapter of the Civil Affairs Handbook for Germany.

(3) Completion of an Official List of Monuments.

(4) Preparation of a Handbook chapter and other directives for the Austrian Country Section.

15. Another AFM unit was activated in March 1944 as part of the Interior Sub-Section of the France Section, Special Staff, Civil Affairs, SHAEF (French Country Unit). The French Country Unit moved from Sarivenham to London, 23 April 1944.

a. Personnel of the AFM Branch, French Country Unit,

WFOB;

(1) Capt Louis B. La Farge, LC (O-905778)

(2) Capt Walker K. Hancock, Inf (O-513319)

b. Principal activities after arriving in London were:

(1) Rewriting part of the subject matter for the Field Handbook for Civil Affairs, France.

(2) Preparation of charts.

(3) Liaison with the French delegation regarding French depositories of works of art, personnel of French museums and libraries, etc.

16. 19 March 1944, the suggested T/O&E was enlarged and submitted.²⁶ This T/O&E provided for a maximum of 27 officers, 6 trucks, $\frac{1}{2}$ ton, 4x4, and miscellaneous technical equipment.

17. The need for specific instructions similar to those issued in Italy was felt well before operational commitment. On 1 April 1944, the Government Affairs Branch, Civil Affairs Special Staff, SHAEF, composed a staff study²⁷ in which both a General Order and letter from SHAEF were recommended. The considerations leading to this recommendation were that:

a. In Northern Europe, it was necessary that the Allies should show the utmost respect for Allied national treasures; our behaviour in this matter would affect feeling after the war.

b. Something more than a general recommendation to respect public monuments and works of art was required.

c. The task of the specialist officers who were to help carry out AFM policy was a new one, and their position novel in any military organization.

d. Considerable publicity had been given to the declared policy of the US and British Governments in relation to the problem of the preservation of monuments and works of art during military operations.

18. Objections voiced by G-5 Operations, SHAEF, to the General Order on Historical Monuments²⁸ drafted by the AFM Sub-Section led to its abandonment. The Adviser on AFM, writing to Brigadier H. Price Williams, G-5, SHAEF²⁹ stated that such an order was necessary in NW Europe, where we should be fighting in the territory of our friends. It was essential that it should be binding for all conditions and Allied personnel,

and not merely an instruction to C.I. Officers.

19. On May 26, 1944 the Supreme Commander Allied Expeditionary Force issued a Letter, Subject: "Preservation of Historical Monuments".³⁰ The text represents an enlargement over the policy of the letter of 29 December 1943, and was undoubtedly influenced by the needs set forth previously by the Adviser AFM. The text, in part, follows:

"Shortly we will be fighting our way across the Continent of Europe in battles designed to preserve our civilization. Inevitably, in the path of our advance will be found historical monuments and cultural centers which symbolize to the world all that we are fighting to preserve.

It is the responsibility of every commander to protect and respect these symbols whenever possible.

In some circumstances the success of the military operation may be prejudiced in our reluctance to destroy these revered objects.

.... there are many circumstances in which damage and destruction are not necessary and cannot be justified. In such cases, through the exercise of restraint and discipline, commanders will preserve centers and objects of historical and cultural significance. Civil Affairs Staffs at higher echelons will advise commanders of the locations of historical monuments of this type, both in advance of the front lines and in occupied areas...."

20. The issuance of the Supreme Commander's letter of 26 May 1945 made desirable a second edition of Civil Affairs Instruction No. 15.³¹ The second edition was considerably enlarged in the light of work done in the preparation of handbooks, and after discussion with various authorities and officers who had seen service as AFM Specialist Officers in the Mediterranean Theater.

21. AFM Policy in the Civil Affairs Directives:

a. The SMHAF Civil Affairs Directive for France, 25 May 1944,³² stated that it was the basic policy of the Supreme Commander to take all measures, consistent with military necessity, to avoid damage to all structures, objects, or documents of cultural, artistic, archaeological or historical value; and to assist, wherever practicable, in securing them from deterioration consequent upon the process of war. Commanding generals were directed to:

- (1) Take such steps as might be consistent with military necessity to insure that no unnecessary or wanton damage was done to such structures or monuments, and make such regulations as they thought fit.
- (2) Take steps to insure that no building listed in the Official Lists of Monuments would be used for military purposes without their explicit permission or that of the commander to whom they might delegate the power to give such permission.

(3) Close any of these buildings.

(4) Insure that the prevention of looting, wanton damage, and sacrilege of buildings by troops, was the responsibility of all commanders.

b. The Civil Affairs Directive for Belgium³⁵ and Luxembourg³⁴ involved no change over that for France.

c. In the Civil Affairs Directive for The Netherlands³⁵ appropriate protection, consistent with the success and security of military operations, was to be extended to public and private records, and archives, art, and other cultural treasures, historic buildings and monuments, and the property of institutions dedicated to religion, charity, education, the arts and sciences.

d. The Directive for the Military Government of Germany, 23 August 1944,³⁶ added several provisions to the policies and procedures. The Supreme Commander announced that it was his policy also to take measures to facilitate the eventual restitution of works of art and objects of scientific or historical importance which might have been looted from Allied Governments or nationals. Commanders were directed to take steps to enforce regulations forbidding the sale, movement, concealment or destruction of any work of art or object of scientific or historical importance, and to insure preservation and guarding of all German records, documents and archives of value to Military Government.

e. In the revised Directive for Military Government of Germany prior to Defeat or Surrender, 9 November 1944,³⁷ an important and comprehensive section on "Records and Archives" was added. The Supreme Commander's policy was to ensure the preservation from destruction, alteration or concealment of all German records, documents, plans or archives of value to the attainment of the objectives of Military Government. Commanders were directed to:

- (1) Take such steps as might be necessary to carry out the above policy.
- (2) Seize and hold records and archives of interest to Military Government.
- (3) Supervise the custody and preservation of records and archives and make provision for their availability to authorized persons.
- (4) Prevent removal of records and archives unless required by military purposes or for safe preservation.
- (5) Use care in the handling of records and archives.
- (6) Take steps to ensure that no unnecessary or wanton damage was done to German records and archives by troops.
- (7) Require German authorities to give any assistance needed.

- (8) Ensure that responsibility for the preservation of records and archives was placed on all military commanders.

22. Special Planning Regarding Archives:

a. Planning in regard to archives as a more specialized field distinct from the usual duties of the MFG Officer was badly retarded during the initial planning phases for several reasons: lack of trained archivists in the armed forces; the highly technical nature of archival procedure; and the broad construction given to the term "archives", which was used to embrace "...all accumulations of documents, both active and historical, and whether public or private".³⁸

b. The Civil Affairs Information Guide, "Field Protection of Objects of Art and Archives", 12 May 1944,³⁹ contained a section on depositories of books, manuscripts, archives, and records, and directions for the protection and salvage of their contents in the event of damage. The Civil Affairs Guide, "Archival Repositories in Germany",⁴⁰ 15 May 1944, listed a total of 47 archival establishments. In addition to the list of German Archives, the War Department also issued a list of archival repositories in France, in mimeographed form, and SCMF issued a "Classified Summary of French Archives".

c. The Handbook for Military Government in Germany Prior to Defeat or Surrender, December 1944, repeated the policy laid down for archives, and also laid down certain instructions for Military Government Officers. The preservation of records and archives was made the responsibility of every military commander. Military Government detachment commanders were to coordinate records and archives activities with other interested elements, to ensure access to records and archives, and to prevent their removal from their location except when necessary. Military Government Officers were to facilitate the use of records and archives under their control by authorized users. Users were to be impressed with the necessity of handling the contents with care and replacing the contents in the order in which found. Instances in which archives seemed to have been removed or tampered with were to be reported. The problem of securing business or administrative archives in current use was recognized as presenting great practical difficulty. Military Government Officers were instructed that the type and importance of the business or administration and its archives, and the likelihood of destruction, alteration, or dispersal, would have to serve as the guide.

d. On 20 August 1944, SCMF issued a letter on the preservation of archives⁴¹ which marked the first concrete definition of policy on archives as distinct from monuments and fine arts. This letter stated that:

- (1) Accumulations of documents connected with business of all kinds, public and private, secular and ecclesiastical, were to be found in all towns.
- (2) The importance of these archives lay in the fact that not only did they contain valuable information, but also they were continuous

series of related documents. They might be ruined by the displacement of a few documents.

- (3) In order to insure that archives were not destroyed or damaged, all buildings in which they were housed would, where practicable, be put "Off Limits" to all troops.
- (4) Local authorities in all large towns would be consulted as to their whereabouts.

e. On 29 December 1944, SHAEF issued a series of "Instructions for the Use by Military Government Officers of Archives mentioned in the 'General List of Archives in Western Germany'",⁴² which list was simultaneously issued. These instructions consisted of two parts, the first a series of rules for the handling and use of archives, the second rules governing the temporary removal, custody, and return of archives in listed repositories. Unfortunately, these rules applied only to Military Government Officers.

23. The "Official Lists" of Monuments:

a. The Country Units (Refer Para 14 and 15) prepared a series of Official Lists of Monuments to accompany Civil Affairs Field Handbooks and/or Directives for the following countries:

- (1) France
- (2) Belgium
- (3) The Netherlands
- (4) Luxembourg
- (5) Germany

b. Considerable difficulty was encountered in the selection of monuments. Many world famous and universally accepted buildings and museums were of course obviously to be listed, but there were also a number of lesser monuments, not so spectacular but equally important from the cultural point of view, between which the choice was not so potent.

c. Some internal dissension arose⁴³ regarding the nature of these lists. It was eventually decided that the SHAEF Official Lists should be the only lists of monuments the use of which would be prohibited to military personnel. In the various Civil Affairs Directives for the countries concerned (with the exception of The Netherlands), it was provided that no monuments listed in these Official Lists would be put to military use without the explicit permission in each case of the Supreme Commander or commanders to whom such authority had been delegated. Commanders were further, at their discretion, to protect, close, or put "Off Limits" to troops any of these monuments, buildings, or sites.

d. The numbers of monuments for the various countries mentioned above were as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------|------|
| (1) France: | 1643 |
| (2) Belgium: | 463 |
| (3) The Netherlands: | 224 |
| (4) Luxembourg: | 30 |
| (5) Germany | 1055 |

The discrepancy between Germany and France was due to the realization that many inhibitions regarding the use of property in Allied territory would no longer be in force in enemy territory. Only the most important monuments were listed, with the emphasis placed definitely upon public and ecclesiastical property. For this reason many private buildings were omitted. The discrepancy between the number of monuments listed for France (1643) and Germany (1055) is even greater than it would appear, for the German Official List included 167 Archives, public and private; the difference between the French Official List, in which archives were not, as a general rule, included, is thus 755 monuments, or 35 more than the total of Belgium, The Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

e. In some cases entire towns were given as official monuments and in other cases singularly effective complexes of buildings, while not forbidden to military use as an entirety were called to the attention of commanders.

CHAPTER 2

PERSONNEL PROCUREMENT AND DEPLOYMENT

SECTION 1

PROCUREMENT

25. The Roberts Commission:

a. The personnel initially assigned to MFAA Activities in the ETO were selected by the Roberts Commission.⁴⁴ A comprehensive biographical list of 123 officers and enlisted men recommended by the Commission was compiled⁴⁵ and sent to the ETO in April 1944. This list was broken down both by qualifications, those of especial fitness being marked with an asterisk (*).

b. In spite of the good offices of the Roberts Commission personnel shortages were chronic. The Adviser, MFAA, G-5 (Ops), SHAFF, in a memorandum⁴⁶ of 27 December 1944, wrote that there was a serious shortage of US MFAA Officers in the theater.

c. Further attempts were made to exact specialists from other branches of the armed forces, with the Civil Affairs Division of the War Department acting as the procurement agency with the advice of the Roberts Commission,⁴⁷ but the number of personnel thus procured remained small.

26. European Civil Affairs Division: Screening of personnel by the European Civil Affairs Division at Shrivenham also produced other officers who, however, with a few exceptions, were not long active in the field.⁴⁸

27. Commissioning of Enlisted Personnel: Additional officer personnel was eventually procured by the direct commissioning of enlisted personnel. Under the provisions of Hq ETOUS Letter, Subject: "Appointment of Second Lieutenants,

AUS, for Duty with Military Government", 29 March 1945,⁴⁹ six enlisted MFL Specialists,⁵⁰ three of whom had been included in the Roberts Commission list, were appointed Second Lieutenants in Army of the United States after a short period of training and indoctrination.

SECTION 2

DEPLOYMENT

28. European Civil Affairs Division: The usual procedure for the deployment of MFL Officers procured for the European Theater was to assign them to the various "I" Detachments, the only detachments which included such an officer on authorized T/Os, and then place the officer concerned on indefinite detached service with armies in the field. It was sometimes necessary to assign the officer or enlisted man to the ECAD Reception and Training Battalion in order to effect an indefinite period of detached service. This mechanism had manifest disadvantages (Refer Par. 31).

29. Assignments to Armies and Army Groups.

a. Of the units within the ETO only SHLEF, Hq ETOUSA, Hq 21 Army Group, Hq 12 Army Group and SHLEF Missions to France and Belgium had, originally, T/O positions for MFL Officers.

b. The following units employed one or more MFL Officers on detached service for an indefinite period: Seine Base Section, Oise Base Section, Hq ADSIC Com Z; First, Third, Seventh, and Ninth US Armies; and Hq 6 Army Group.

c. Fifteenth US Army was the first army in the field to allot a definite position within the G-5 non-T/O allotment of grades and ratings to an MFL Officer.

d. After the initial deployment of armies and army groups, the first station list of MFL Officers assigned to or on detached service with organizations in the field, exclusive of "I" detachments, was as follows (asterisks indicate assignments): First Canadian Army*; Zone of Communications (ETOUSA)*; (Oise Base, Seine Base, Hq ADSIC Com Z); British Line of Communications*; 6 and 12th Army Groups; SHLEF* and SHLEF Missions to France*, Belgium*, and The Netherlands.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PART ONE

1. American Defense - Harvard Group, Report for 1942 - 1944 (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751 (US Comm)).
2. Letter to the Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, from William Bell Dinsmoor, President, Archaeological Institute of America, 15 March 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 1).
3. "Memorandum for the Secretary of War Relative to the Military Steps to be Taken for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe", signed by Francis Henry Taylor, Director, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, 15 March 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 2).
4. Letter to Brigadier General Cornelius W. Wickersham, Director, School of Military Government, Charlottesville, Va., from William Bell Dinsmoor, Archaeological Institute of America, 7 April 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 4).
5. Letter to the Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, from William Bell Dinsmoor, Archaeological Institute of America, 11 May 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 11).
6. Minutes of the First Full Meeting, ACLS Committee, 25 June 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 22).
7. Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas, Summary of Activities to 10 June 1944. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751 (US Comm)).
8. Committee of the ACLS on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas, Summary for the Month of July 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 43).
9. Draft of letter, signer unknown, to the President of the United States, 20 April 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 9).
10. For the Press from Department of State, "The American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe", State Dept No. 348, 20 August 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 53).
11. Memorandum for the Acting Director, CAD, through PWG, Subj: "Protection of Museum Property", from Brig Gen Cornelius W. Wickersham, WD, SMG, Charlottesville, Va., 1 April 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 3).
12. Memorandum for the Secretary of War, Subj: "Protection of Works of Art and Historic Monuments", from Maj Gen John H. Hilldring, CAD, OCS, 27 April 1943 (CAD 71748). (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 8).

13. Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of War, Subj: "Protection of Historic Monuments", from Maj Gen John E. Hilldring, CAD, OCS, 21 July 1943 (CAD 2947) (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 32).
14. Memorandum for the Chief, CAD, OCS, Subj: "Artistic and Historic Monuments", from Lt Col Charles P. Burnett, GSC, Chief, Government Branch, CAD, 26 October 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 92).
15. Letter from Col Henry C. Newton, Inf, CAD, OCS, to Professor Geoffrey Webb, Ministry of Home Security, Home Office Building, Whitehall, London, 20 April 1944. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751, (Correspondence: Col Newton)).
16. Memorandum, "Measures for the Protection of Works of Art and Ancient Monuments in any Projected Invasion of the European Continent", from S. J. Gallman, 1st Sec'y of the US Embassy, to the Sec'y of State, Washington, D. C. (State Dept Dispatch No. 9762), 25 June 1943. (CALA G-5 Files, Folder 130, No. 8996/1, p. 16).
17. "CA Section of Fine Arts, Monuments and Archives", Memorandum to G. F. Webb, Esq., Home Office, and Maj Gen Sir Roger Lumley, CCAO, Norfolk House, November 1943 (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751 (P&P) General).
18. Letter, Subj: "Historical Monuments", (AG OOO.4-1), Allied Force Headquarters, Office of the Commander in Chief, 29 December 1943. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/3 (P&P) Directives).
19. General Order No. 68, "Historical Monuments", Allied Force Headquarters, 29 December 1943. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/3 (P&P) Directives).
20. Draft for the Charter and Establishment of the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section under the Civil Affairs Division, Hq SAC. (CA 20 (b)), 18 January 1944. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/1 (P&P) - Drafts: General).
21. War Department Cable Tm #83, 19 November 1943, and War Office Cable CIV #122 of 25 November 1943.
22. Civil Affairs Instruction No. 15, "Public Monuments and Fine Arts", (SHAEF/CA/GOV/PM/300.4), for Operation OVERLORD, RAINIER "C", SHAEF, 17 February 1944. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/3 (P&P) Directives).
23. Report to June 1944, from the Adviser, MFAA, G-5 (Ops), SHAEF, to C of S, SHAEF. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/1 (REP) - Reports: Special).
24. "Report on Status of Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives in the European Theater of Operations", by Col Henry C. Newton, Inf, w/Letter, Subj: "MFAA Report", (SHAEF/G-5/751-000.4-1) SHAEF, G-5, 13 June 1944. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751-Correspondence: Col Newton).
25. Memorandum to the Commanding General, Civil Affairs Division, SHAEF, Subj: "Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives", from Capt Louis B. La Forge, AC, CA Center, American School Center, APO 645, 5 March 1944. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751 (Org) - Organization: General).

26. "Suggested Establishment for Public Monuments and Fine Arts Section", w/Letter, SHAEF/CA/SS/PLA/1, SHAEF, SS, CA Planning Section, 19 March 1944.
27. Staff Study, Monuments and Fine Arts, Proposal for a General Order and Letter from SCAEF, (SHAEF/CA/GOV/13/3), SHAEF, CA, SS, Government Affairs Branch, 1 April 1944 (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/1 (P&P) - Drafts: General).
28. Monuments Ordinance, Final Draft (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/3 (P&P) - Policy and Procedure: Directives).
29. Demi-Official Letter from Geoffrey Webb, Adviser, MFAA, SHAEF CA Special Staff, to Brigadier H. Price Williams, G-5 SHAEF, 9 May 1944 (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/3 (P&P) Directives).
30. Letter, Subject: "Preservation of Historical Monuments," (AG(SHAEF/G-5/751/1/3) (P&P): Directives).
31. Civil Affairs Instruction No. 15, "Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives," Second Edition (Draft), (SHAEF/CA/MFAA/OO1.01), SHAEF, G-5, MFAA, undated. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/1/3 (P&P), Directives).
32. Civil Affairs Directives for Operation OVERLORD-FRANCE, (AG 014.1-1 GE-AGM), SHAEF, 25 May 1944, Annex 6, "Public Monuments and Fine Arts."
33. Annexure 5, "Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives," to Directive on Civil Affairs, Belgium, SHAEF, (AG 014.1-1 (Belgium) GE-AGM), (SHAEF/5/703), 1 September 1944.
34. Annexure 5 to Directive on Civil Affairs, Luxembourg (AG 014.1-1 (Luxembourg) GE-AGM), SHAEF, 30 September 1944.
35. Civil Affairs Directives - THE NETHERLANDS, (AG 014.1-1 (Netherlands) GE-AGM), SHAEF, 14 August 1945, ANNEX 2, "Government Affairs, Paragraph 6, "Fine Arts, Monuments, Archives and Records."
36. Directive for Military Government of Germany, with Letter, "Directive to Army Group Commanders on Military Government of GERMANY." (SHAEF/G-5/(Ops)/604) SHAEF, G-5 Division, 23 August 1944, ANNEX IV, SECTION XVIII, "Monuments and Fine Arts and Archives."
37. "Directive for Military Government of GERMANY Prior to Defeat or Surrender," (AG 014.1-1 (Germany) GE-AGM), SHAEF, 9 November 1944, ANNEX III, Section 1, Paragraph 15, "Records and Archives," and Section XVIII, "Monuments and Fine Arts."
38. Handbook for Military Government in Germany Prior to Defeat or Surrender, SHAEF, December 1944, Part III, Chapter XVI, Paragraph 1197.
39. War Department pamphlet No. 31-103, WD, 12 May 1944.
40. War Department pamphlet No. 31-180, WD, 15 May 1944.
41. Letter, Subject: "Preservation of Archives," (AG 000.4-1 GAP-AGM), SHAEF, 20 August 1944.

42. "Instructions for the Use by Military Government Officers of Archives Mentioned in the General List of Archives of Western Germany," SHAEF/G-5 (Ops)/751/4, SHAEF, G-5 Ops, MFAA, 21 December 1944.
43. Memorandum on Report of Col H. C. Newton, from the Adviser, MFAA, SHAEF G-5 (Ops), to Chief, Ops, SHAEF G-5, 26 June 1944. (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751 - Correspondence: Col Newton).
44. Major Theodore Sizer, AC (O-167115); Captain Walker W. Hancock, Inf (O-513319); Captain Mason Hammond, AC (O-918013); Captain Marvin C. Ross, USMC (O-16548); Captain Louis B. Le Farge, AC (O-905778); 2d Lt Calvin Hathway, QMC (O-1591790); 2d Lt Glamville Downey, SC (O-1640401).
45. "List of Officers Recommended by the American Commission for Assignment to MFAA, ETO" (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/2/1 (Pers): Personnel - Officers: US, General).
46. Memo to G-5 OPET (Lt Col Kernkamp) from MFAA, G-5 Ops, SHAEF (SHAEF/G-5 (Ops)/751); Subj: "Request for Information on MFAA Personnel", 27 December 1944 (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751 (Pers) - Personnel: General).
47. Memorandum for Col Henry C. Newton, Subj: "Personnel for MFAA under SHAEF", from Maj Mason Hammond, AC, MFAA, US Go CC (Germany), (MFAA Files, RD&R Div, OMG, USFET, Folder 751/2/1, (Pers): Personnel - Officers: US, General).
48. Major Roscoe P. Dewitt (O-483997); Major Stratton Hammon (O-374907); Capt Gilbert R. Doane (O-534535); Capt Ralph Hammett, SR (O-534712); Capt Robert K. Posey, CE (O-228681); 1st Lt Edward T. Boardman (O-513116); 2d Lt Roger Clarke, AC (O-557144); 2d Lt Daniel J. Kern (O-269195); 2d Lt James B. Larwood, SR (O-529947); 2d Lt William A. Lovegrove (O-1797674).
49. Letter, Subj: "Appointment of Second Lieutenants, AUS, for Duty with Military Government", (AG 210.1 MPGA), Hq ETOUSA, 29 March 1945.
50. 2nd Lt (S/Sgt) Robert Koch (34259924) (O-2011931)
 2nd Lt (T/5) Sheldon Keck (32977223) (O-2025818)
 2nd Lt (Pfc) Lemont Moore (32977223) (O-2011967)
 2nd Lt (T/4) Samuel Ratensky (33639236) (O-20225838)
 2nd Lt (T/5) John D. Skilton, Jr. (31415778) (O-2026446)
 2nd Lt (S/Sgt) Frederick Schrady (32972683) (O-2025832)

THE GENERAL BOARD
UNITED STATES FORCES, EUROPEAN THEATER
APO 408

CIVIL AFFAIRS AND MILITARY GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES IN
CONNECTION WITH MONUMENTS, FINE ARTS, AND ARCHIVES

PART TWO

MAJOR PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN MONUMENTS, FINE ARTS,

AND ARCHIVES OPERATIONS

CHAPTER 1

ADMINISTRATIVE, TECHNICAL, AND SUPPLY PROBLEMS

SECTION 1

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

30. Channels of Communication.

a. MFAA Officers were to use prescribed command channels for routine reports, submitting these reports for indorsement to the next higher organization. Special reports on emergency field situations, and fortnightly reports (Refer Par. 32), were sent direct to the Adviser, MFAA, G-5 SHAEP. For all other matters prescribed staff and command channels had to be followed.

b. In a static situation, command channels were necessary and effectual. However, where the loss of a day might mean the loss of an incomparably valuable edifice and its contents, the delay imposed by these channels sometimes proved contrary to the purpose of the MFAA mission.

31. Staff Status and Command Authority.

a. The Adviser, MFAA, SHAEP, had wanted to avoid the MFAA experience in Italy. MFAA Officers had been assigned to definite units and restricted to the unit's operational area. This had led to want of supervision in areas without such officers, with a proportional increase of avoidable damage which might have been forestalled had the officers been permitted free circulation. In order to affect a continuously existing pool of specialists, who might be attached and re-attached to various units according to operational necessity, these officers were in general placed on temporary duty or detached service with units in the field from the only organizations authorized to accommodate them, the Reception and Training Battalion of EC&D, or various inoperative CA detachments. (Refer Par. 28).

b. From the inception of planning the status of the MFAA Officer was that of "adviser" to tactical and administrative commanders; no stipulations as to actual inclusion of these officers within the official command framework of the military organization were made.

c. After operational commitment had demonstrated the disadvantageous position of the MFAA Officers, there still remained no

means of remedying the situation so long as, in order to be deployed in the field at all, basic assignment to ECAD and attachment therefrom to field units was necessary.¹

d. In many instances when it became necessary for MFAA Officers to operate among lower echelons in the field, their position as presumptive members of the G-5 Sections was cited as a reason for preventing operations of a technical nature which, though nominally the responsibility of commanders of lower echelons and Civil Affairs/Military Government Detachments, could not be carried out except by the MFAA Officers themselves.²

e. On 18 April 1945, due to the increased administrative burdens of occupation, Hq Fifteenth US Army issued a Memorandum³ assigning various G-5 responsibilities to other General and Staff Sections. In this memorandum, the responsibility for "monuments" was assigned to the Engineer. In no previous directive or publication had a "monument" been defined, and the MFAA Specialist Officer, Fifteenth US Army, pointed out to the AC of S, G-5, not only the need for clarification but for the assignment of additional MFAA responsibilities to other General and Special Staff Sections.

f. A subsequent Memorandum,⁴ "Staff Responsibilities for MFAA" was issued on 30 April 1945. The memorandum stated that in regard to monuments, fine arts and archives the army commander had been charged with three primary responsibilities:

- (1) Safeguard from damage or deterioration consequent upon the process of war of all structures, objects, or documents of cultural, artistic, archaeological, or historical value.
- (2) Maintenance or reactivation of the civilian agencies charged with the care of monuments, fine arts and archives in Germany.
- (3) Preservation and exploitation of all documents and archives of value to the attainment of the objectives of Military Government.

g. The original reassignment of G-5 Section responsibilities to other General and Special Staff Sections had assigned to the Engineer the added responsibility for monuments. A monument was defined, for operational purposes, as "Any structure, real property, or site, including fixed objects, but exclusive of readily moveable objects, which, by reason of its cultural, artistic, historic, or archaeological value, should be protected in implementation of the policy of the army commander". In regard to monuments as defined, the responsibilities of the Engineer were:

- (1) Protection of monuments from damage which might result from construction or demolition projects in the immediate vicinity.
- (2) Where practicable, the supply of Engineer materials necessary for the protection of such monuments.
- (3) Prevention of requisition for military use of such monuments as might be exempted from military use by the army commander.

h. In view of the interest of monuments, fine arts and archives to certain other General and Special Staff Sections, further assignment of responsibilities was made as follows:

(1) To the AC of S, G-2, responsibility for:

- (a) Clearance of enemy personnel necessary for the maintenance or reactivation of civilian agencies charged with the care of monuments, fine arts and archives in Germany.
- (b) Exploitation of documents and archives, subject to such directives as might be issued by the Fifteenth US Army or higher headquarters.

(2) To the AC of S, G-3, responsibility for:

- (a) Provision of military safeguard consistent with established priorities when, in the opinion of the AC of S, G-5, such safeguard was necessary for the protection of monuments, fine arts and archives.

(3) To the Provost Marshal, responsibility for:

- (a) Authentication of such "Off Limits" or other notices as might be provided for protective purposes by the MFAA Officer.

1. By means of this reassignment of responsibilities complete staff coordination for MFAA was achieved.

SECTION 2

TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

32. Field Reports.

a. As originally contemplated,⁵ the MFAA Officers were to keep three specific types of records and reports:

- (1) Diary.
- (2) Fortnightly Report.
- (3) Field Record.

b. The diary was to maintain a brief consecutive record or log of the activities of the MFAA Officer. Entries were to be made by date and hour. Monuments inspected or visited, reports submitted, and orders received were to be noted.

c. The fortnightly report was to inform officers at higher headquarters of the principal activities of the reporting officer during the two weeks preceding the date of the report. Submitted in triplicate, it was to contain a description of major activities for the period: places visited, monuments inspected, action taken for protection or emergency repair, instructions on procedures at various localities, personnel under the charge of the MFAA Officer, status of equipment, supplies and transportation, and

a brief consideration of all matters pertaining to the work.

d. The field record was to provide specific data on the condition of buildings and objects inspected, and on instances of actual or reputed damage or deterioration. The field record was to be kept on a specific form (Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Field Record Form), in triplicate, and typewritten if possible.

e. In addition to the Field Record Form, a similar form for the reporting of chance finds of objects was devised. These forms, by their comprehensiveness, possessed great disadvantages. Without specialized clerical assistance or lacking portable assigned office equipment, execution of the forms became quite impractical, and their use for reporting purposes was all but discarded early in the operational period.

f. No specific sequence of contents for the fortnightly report was prescribed. Great divergence in make-up occurred between the reports of the various MFAA Officers in the field. Since these reports were to be collated and consolidated at both Army group and SHAETF Hq, this irregularity of pattern presented considerable difficulty from the point of view of unifying, in one comprehensive report, the activities of officers at lower units.

g. In December 1944, Lt George L. Stout, USNR, then MFAA Officer at 12 Army Group, with the assistance of Colonel Henry C. Newton, devised a uniform report form for the MFAA Officers under that command. This consisted of five principal paragraphs:

- (1) Personnel.
- (2) Information.
- (3) Operations: monuments and sites inspected, arranged alphabetically by town, and if more than one, alphabetically within the subheading of the town. Under each monument inspected, the following information was to be given:
 - (a) Name of Monument and Location.
 - (b) Date Inspected
 - (c) Condition of Area
 - (d) Condition of Monument
 - (e) Contents
 - (f) Military Use
 - (g) Person(s) Interviewed
 - (h) Photographs
 - (i) War Damage
 - (j) War Protection
- (4) Supply.
- (5) Remarks: additional information, and recommendations not included in the four paragraphs listed

above.

h. With the inception of this standard system, reference to previous reports, and the consolidation of information as it flowed into higher headquarters, became much easier.

33. Extent of Areas Covered.

a. The areas to be covered by MFAA Officers grew, within a very short time, to such an extent that it was practically impossible to inspect and report on all the officially protected monuments, much less those not mentioned on the Official Lists.

b. Up to 1 December 1944, during the first four months of operations within Hq Com Z, the work of an average of two and one-half MFAA Officers in the field was summarized by the AC of S, G-5, Hq Com Z, as follows:⁶

SITES INSPECTED

Advance Section	224
Seine Section	270
Loire Section	254
Brittany Base Section	233
Oise Section	199
Normandy Base Section	34
Monuments and Depositories	26
SITES INSPECTED, TOTAL.....	1240

TOWNS VISITED

Advance Section	120
Seine Section	190
Loire Section	69
Brittany Base Section	74
Oise Section	104
Normandy Base Section	17
Monuments and Depositories	23
TOWNS VISITED, TOTAL.....	597

The AC of S, G-5, Hq Com Z, pointed out that in view of transportation difficulties, the averages of 125 sites per man per month, and 60 towns per man per month, were excellent.

c. Col Henry C. Newton, in his report⁷ of 20 December 1944, wrote that the MFAA Officer, Advance Section, Com Z, had travelled nearly 12,000 miles in 13 weeks in connection with his various inspections.

d. According to a report⁸ of the AC of S, G-5, Hq Com Z, between D-Day and 1 March 1945, the MFAA Officers of Com Z had inspected over 1500 individual monuments (churches, museums, chateaux, etc.).

e. By 25 April 1945, the area of 12 Army Group in Germany alone contained approximately 47,000 square miles. In this area there were only two full time MFAA Officers, with the First and Third US Armies, and one substitute MFAA Officer with Ninth US Army, the regular officer having been killed in action. The MFAA Officer of the First US Army, with approximately 15,000 square miles to cover in one of the richest cultural areas in Germany, was without assigned transportation or enlisted assistance.⁹

f. A recapitulation of the Official Lists for France, Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Germany reveals a total of 3415 items. For the major part of operations, the MEA officers in the field averaged ten in number. This averaged 341.5 officially listed monuments per officer, and did not include on several thousand other structures eventually to come under their purview, or the approximately 350 known depositories of works of art which were within the area of US forces in Germany by 7 May 1945.

34. Emergency Protective Materials.

a. In the field practically no restoration, protection or repair of monuments as originally envisaged was undertaken. The reasons for this were:

- (1) Lack of any agreed priority or requisitioning procedure.
- (2) The practical impossibility of obtaining materials for purposes of repair, protection or restoration.
- (3) Unwillingness of national or local authorities to furnish materials when urgent humanitarian demands were being made.
- (4) Lack of any clearly defined responsibility placed on any military organization for the supply of materials.

b. As operations progressed, the damage from aerial and artillery bombardment became so great that no quantity of materials which could be regularly supplied through the US Army would have been sufficient to effect substantial repairs or protection.

c. In isolated cases, it was sometimes possible for MEA Officers to procure materials through the individual cooperation of sympathetic special staff sections of the units to which they were attached,¹⁰ but in general operational priorities and military needs were such as to make this process rare.

d. It was not until the publication by the Fifteenth US Army of the memorandum on "Staff Responsibilities for Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives" (Refer Par. 31, h) 30 April 1944, that a particular staff section of a unit was given the definite responsibility of supplying protective materials for MEA purposes. By means of this assignment of responsibility, the MEA Specialist Officer, Fifteenth US Army, was enabled to provide urgently needed protective materials for the cathedrals of Bonn and Cologne, and the Quirinskirche at Neuss (TF/2689).

35. Protection and Evacuation of Depositories.

a. Depositories of art collections removed from their normal locations, and dispersed for protection presented no very great problems in France and Belgium. In France the most important depository of works of art, established before the declaration of hostilities, was at Suresnes. In Belgium the area of the country was relatively so small that return of works of art to museums was comparatively easy for the national authorities without aid from the US Forces.

b. The first problem of any magnitude involving a depository

was encountered by the First US Army with the discovery of the hiding place of the greatest Dutch public and private collections at St. Pietersburg (WK-506500) near Maastricht.¹¹ The collection consisted largely of paintings, drawings, and prints of Netherlandish and Flemish masters, 15th to 20th centuries. There were, in addition, many works by Italian masters and a smaller number of English, French, German, and Spanish origin. The paintings alone numbered about 800. A limited number of archives, textiles, ceramics, scientific specimens, and few musical instruments were also contained in the depository. The principal museums and collections from which the collection had been brought were:

- (1) Ryksmuseum, Amsterdam
- (2) Mauritshuis, The Hague
- (3) The four Royal Palaces
- (4) Franz Hals Museum, Haarlem
- (5) Lakenhal, Leyden
- (6) Froisch Museum, Leeuwarden.

It was reported the "the general quality of the holdings was very high and the aggregate value beyond estimate."

c. The second major depository to be discovered was that at Siegen (WG/2053). The existence of this depository had been known for some time. A marked catalogue, found in the Suermondt Museum at Aachen by the MFAA Officer of the First US Army in October 1944, listed several important objects which had been moved prior to the Russian advances in September, 1944, from Meissen to Siegen. On 2 April 1944, the MFAA Specialist Officer, First US Army, arrived at the depository, an iron mine, while the city was still under artillery fire.¹² The depository contained over 400 paintings, including many of the best from museums of Aachen, Siegen, Essen, Cologne, Wuppertal, and Münster. In addition to some 60 pieces of sculpture (unpacked) there were some 35 or more cases from Cologne museums and 40 cases from the Landes-Museum of Bonn. The cathedral treasures of Metz, Aachen, and Essen were identified, as well as miscellaneous boxes marked with the names of other Rhineland churches. There were also about 40 boxes from the Beethoven Museum in Bonn, including the manuscript of the Sixth Symphony. Great damage had been done by dampness. Because of operational urgency, the depository had to be left under guard by the Eighth Infantry Division, and evacuation did not begin until 25 May 1945.

d. Though the find at Siegen had led MFAA Officers in the advancing armies to expect recurrences of similar situations, the discovery of the depository at Bernterode (C-9016), Kreis Worbis,¹³ pointed up the general problem of depositories in a way which had not been accomplished hitherto. The depository was located in the Heeres-Munitions-Anstalt at Bernterode, a salt mine, since 1936 used as a munitions plant. At the time of the first inspection, 29 April 1945, about 400,000 tons of ammunition and quantities of military supplies were stored in the mine. Captain Walker K. Hancock, MFAA Officer, First US Army, inspected the depository. The room was found to be a rectangle, 45 feet by 17 feet, parallel to the main corridor and separated from it by 15 feet of rock and masonry. The contents of the depository were in part as follows:

- (1) Caskets of Field Marshal von Hindenburg; Frau

von Hindenburg; Friedrich Wilhelm I, "der Soldaten König"; Frederick the Great.

- (2) 225 banners, both painted and embroidered, dating from the early Prussian wars and including many of the war of 1914-1918.
- (3) 63 cases of books, china, textiles, tapestries, altarclothes, and other objects lay boxed and unboxed within the bays.
- (4) The Hohenzollern Museum Treasures, including crown jewels.

e. Because of the precarious conditions at the depository, the Chief of Staff, First US Army, directed that it should be evacuated. The MFAA Officer, Hq 12 Army Group, Lt George L. Stout, USNR, arrived 30 April to take part in the work. The following day the MFAA Officer, First US Army, returned to his headquarters with the three boxes containing the Hohenzollern Treasure. On the morning of 2 May 1945 they were opened and the contents inspected in the office of the Chief of Staff, First US Army. The Scepter and Orb were replaced in the boxes from which they had been taken and all three boxes repacked for shipment to Frankfurt by convoy. Between 3 May 1945 and 9 May 1945 the remainder of the objects in the mine were evacuated.

f. Prior to 7 May 1945, the largest and most valuable depository discovered in the US zone of operations was that at Merkers (H-6851), Regierungsbezirk Eisenach.¹⁴ The mine was inspected by Capt Robert K. Posey, MFAA Officer, Third US Army, 8 and 11 April 1945.¹⁵ A brief check of the artistic contents disclosed that the collections were from 14 of the most important German museums and archives. 16 April 1945, Lt Stout, USNR, MFAA Officer, G-5, 12 Army Group, made a spot check of the boxes and cases and came to the conclusion that they constituted great wealth. 17 April 1945, a convoy consisting of 26 trucks performed the move from Merkers to the Reichsbank, Frankfurt. The actual number of art objects removed from the mine during this period follows:

Paintings, uncrated	393
Boxes of prints	2,091
Cases of miscellaneous objects, including paintings and sculpture	1,214
Textiles	<u>140</u>
	3,838

g. The above statements give only a slight idea of the conditions in which most of the depositories were found. In the case of two depositories, Bernterode and Merkers, the immediate interest of high-ranking army officials facilitated evacuation. 232 depositories within the area of that command had been reported to Hq 12 Army Group by 30 April 1945.¹⁶ Though most of these were in no way commensurate in value of holdings to those described above, the auspices under which the most important of them were evacuated by seldom more than three MFAA Officers working together at one time were often far from favorable.

36. Protection of Archives.

a. According to the definition of "Archives" adopted,

almost any accumulation of documents came within the use of the term. For Western Germany alone, the SHAEF "Official General List of Archives in Western Germany" listed approximately 1304 archives. The dispersal of archives was even greater than that of works of art. When operations in Germany disclosed enough of the country to make estimates for the future possible, four usual contingencies were discovered:

- (1) Buildings housing the archives had been destroyed, leaving the contents inaccessible.
- (2) Buildings housing the archives had been destroyed, after the contents had been dispersed, making restoration of the contents to their original repository impossible.
- (3) Buildings were completely or fairly intact, along with their contents, leaving only a security problem.
- (4) Buildings were completely or fairly intact, but their contents had been so widely dispersed that no restoration to their original repository was possible.

b. Only (3) and (4) above presented problems for the MFAA Officers. In the case of (3), the building would, if possible, be posted "Off Limits" and, if especially valuable, be put under military guard. This minimal protection was not always possible. The Staatsarchiv of Marburg (C-7347), the second largest Staatsarchiv in Germany, though a monument on the Official List of Protected Monuments, Germany, was occupied by troops.¹⁷ Much irreparable loss to the contents as well as damage to the building was suffered as a result of mistreatment and carelessness. At Jesberg (C-9967) the archives dispersed from the Marburg Staatsarchiv (about 7,000 parcels) had been dumped out of the depository in the courthouse onto the grass,¹⁸ just previous to the inspection, to make room for military occupation.

c. The largest single depository of dispersed archives was uncovered in the Fortress of Ehrenbreitstein (WL/9195). On 23 October 1944, the Archivist of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg reported to MFAA Officers of the First US Army that the archives of former rulers of the Grand Duchy had been removed in 1942 to Ehrenbreitstein by the Germans. Information later given by officials in Bonn indicated that an archival repository of major importance existed at the fortress. The principal archival collections within the Fortress were: rooms full of vital statistics of cities, arranged alphabetically from Aachen to Zulpich; the City Archives of Wiesbaden, Trier, Mainz, Dusseldorf, Osnabruck, Soester, Koblenz, and Bonn; the Archives of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg; the Royal Archives of the House of Orange-Nassau; numbering in the aggregate, several million items. In a Memorandum for the Chief of Staff, Fifteenth US Army,¹⁹ the AC of S, G-5, Fifteenth US Army, pointed out that:

- (1) The archives belonging to German cities and institutions came, in their majority, from locations later incapable of offering protection. There was no structure remaining in the Rhineland more suited to the purpose of protection than the Fortress in which they were housed.
- (2) The personnel necessary to institute and continue an inventory could conservatively be estimated

at 20 curatorial or archival specialists, or approximately the skeleton staff of the archives concerned. Such personnel could not be supplied by the Allied Forces. The task would probably be a matter of three to four years; at least the time occupied by the formation of the depository.

SECTION 3

SUPPLY AND SECURITY PROBLEMS

37. Transportation.

a. The problem of covering extensive operational areas was greatly complicated from the beginning by lack of adequate transportation.

b. The original T/O & E for MFAA operations (Refer Par. 10, d) included six trucks, 1/2-ton, 4x4 (jeeps) for the use of the MFAA Officers attached to SHAEF and army group headquarters. This T/O & E, while it would have been insufficient in the light of future necessities, was none the less more ample in its provisions than none at all.

c. Field reports from all US commands for the subsequent operational period reflect the inconveniences and disadvantages of the lack of this fundamental requirement.

d. Colonel Henry C. Newton, in a letter²⁰ to the AC of S, G-5, Hq 12 Army Group, 25 November 1945, took up the matter from an overall operational point of view, and in a special report for the War Department, 20 December 1944,²¹ reiterated this stand and enlarged on the inconveniences of the lack of transportation.

e. In spite of constant and repeated requests this problem was never fully solved in any US command.

38. Photographic Equipment. The six Leica cameras included in the proposed MFAA T/O & E were never procured. MFAA Officers went into the field either with their own equipment, or with none.

39. Distribution of Information, Publications, and Intelligence.

a. When the first handbooks and atlases were published in May and June, 1944, they were sent to the Provost Marshal General's Office, Washington, D. C., for further distribution to the theater. No prescribed channel from the Provost Marshal General's Office to the officers in the field had been laid out.

b. Col Henry C. Newton, in his report of 20 December 1944,²² wrote:

"Invariably, the documents prepared in the United States by the War Department, assisted by various civilian agencies, have reached this Theater of Operations too late to be of great value."

c. By February 1945, necessary publications had largely been received. Distribution of lists and atlases to tactical and Military Government units was satisfactory. However, the problem of protecting monuments in Germany was overshadowed by a different

problem, that of intelligence information regarding the looting and dispersal of Allied collections, and the enemy personnel responsible for such looting. Lists of German personnel²³ had been drawn up by S/Ldr Douglas Cooper, RAF, MFAA Officer, British Element, Control Commission for Germany, on the basis of intelligence information available in London. The disadvantage of these lists was that the information contained was largely obsolete by the time it arrived in the field. S/Ldr Cooper had also maintained an indexed card file of German personnel, containing much more information than the lists. In April 1945, the MFAA Specialist Officer, No Fifteenth US Army, made arrangements in London for the reproduction and distribution of the cards to officers in the field. These arrived at various headquarters some six weeks later.

40. Posting of Notices.

a. Although the policy regarding officially protected monuments stated that these monuments would be put "Off Limits" to troops, at the commencement of operations no notices had been printed or distributed to the MFAA Officers in the field. "Off Limits" notices were occasionally supplied by field units themselves.

b. "Off Limits" and other notices, when affixed to historical monuments, were usually signed "by command of" the army or other unit commander of the area at the time the notice was affixed. As soon as the area changed command, the notices were not valid. On 7 February 1945 Hq 12 Army Group issued a Circular,²⁴ "Posting of Notices on Monuments, Collections and Archives", which established a uniform procedure for posting of monuments within the area of that command.

CHAPTER 2

APPLICATION OF MONUMENTS, FINE ARTS, AND ARCHIVES POLICY

TO FIELD OPERATIONS

SECTION 1

CONFLICTS OF POLICY

41. Billeting and Supervision of Troops in Historic Monuments.

a. The greatest single problem of the MFAA Officer in the field in liberated territory was the protection of historic buildings from spoliation and damage by US forces. The factors contributing to this were by no means all to the discredit of the US forces. Primary among these factors were:

- (1) Incomplete knowledge of the existence of a policy for the protection of historic/artistic monuments among tactical commanders.²⁵
- (2) Over-riding emergencies in which the need for troop accommodation outweighed any considerations.²⁶
- (3) Lack of instruction and discipline of the troops themselves.²⁷
- (4) Over-enthusiasm on the part of the liberated

authorities, who offered the use of buildings which later suffered.²⁸

- (5) Political pressure, for the protection of private property.²⁹
- (6) The understandable feeling on the part of US troops that buildings which had been occupied for four years by German units were consequently open to immediate use.

b. Difficulties of this nature began almost as soon as did military operations on the Continent. Perhaps fortunately, the areas chosen for the initial landings were not architecturally the richest, so far as domestic architecture is concerned, in France.

c. With the liberation of Paris and the immediately surrounding area at the end of August 1944, and the consequent establishment of several large headquarters with numerous supporting units within the city, an acute situation developed. Many of the buildings requisitioned were on the Official List of Protected Monuments. Some, omitted from the list, were none the less worthy of as much consideration as others which had been included. MFAA Officers were constantly being called upon to justify the military necessity for occupancy of a monument on the Official List, or to protect a monument not so covered. In each case, a command decision was necessary before the occupancy or evacuation could begin officially, and in the meantime, irreparable damage might be done. (Refer Par. 30, b).

d. It was not long after repeated occupations, that complaints became so numerous that by October 1944 official action was necessary. A Letter,³⁰ "Preservation of Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives", issued from Hq Com Z, 1 October 1944, called attention of all subordinate units to the Supreme Commander's policy and directed special attention to the problem of billeting.

e. On 28 October 1944, Hq Oise Section, Com Z, issued further instructions,³¹ and shortly afterward additional official action from higher headquarters was forthcoming. On 14 November 1944 a Letter,³² "Use of Buildings, Their Contents, and Other Property by Military Personnel" was issued by Hq ETOUSA.

f. However, renewed publication of directives, and additions to the disciplinary and supervisory measures taken, did not necessarily abate the problem, as may be seen from the report³³ of the AC of S, G-5, Hq Com Z, to the AC of S, G-5, SHAEF, of 9 December 1944:

"Lawless occupancy of chateaux by US Military personnel presents the greatest single problem at the moment. This condition is prevalent in the Paris region and east of Paris where Service Troops are now necessarily quartered; i.e. Seine and Oise Sections."

g. With the addition of Belgium to the liberated territory the problem became genuinely severe. This country concentrated within a much smaller area a great number of exquisite smaller buildings which were not officially listed.

h. Attempts to counteract a critical situation were made by the tactical units (First, Third, and Ninth US Armies) operating in the country during January and February 1944. The MFAA Officer,

Ninth US Army, in his report of 3 January 1945³⁴ determined that no US Army organization had been given the responsibility for taking and retaining inventories of personal property in buildings requisitioned. Some objects were invariably damaged, destroyed, or stolen, causing conditions under which unwarranted and exorbitant claims could be made by owners against the US Army. This officer recommended that MFAA Officers should receive periodic listings of buildings assigned to troop units, or which were on the list to be assigned.

i. Two more official publications from the Communications Zone were forthcoming during January 1945. The first of these was a Letter, "Preservation of Historic Buildings and Monuments", issued by Hq ADSEC Com Z, 25 January 1945.³⁵ The second, "Occupation of Chateaux by Allied Armies", was issued from Hq Com Z, 29 January 1945.³⁶

j. So long as US troops continued to be operational the billeting situation remained a source of difficulty to all US and Allied personnel concerned.³⁷

42. Restitution.

a. Restitution of looted works of art to the countries of their pre-war ownership had always played a major part in MFAA planning. In the case of France and Belgium, it was discovered that looting of national cultural treasures was practically negligible. Certain inestimably valuable paintings and sculpture had been removed from Belgium at the last moment, and secreted in depositories not uncovered until after 7 May 1944.

b. In order to prevent any illicit disposal of looted works of art, cultural objects, archives, and so forth, the provisions of Military Government Law #52, Blocking and Control of Property, were particularly stringent. If restitution was to be effected, this required, in each instance:

- (1) A specific order from SHAEF for the removal and restitution of the property.
- (2) A certificate of title to the property claimed.
- (3) An exact inventory of the property to be removed.
- (4) Receipt forms for the property removed.

c. These requirements, which were necessary and legally unimpeachable, were onerous in the case of looted archives. If representations were made to Supreme Headquarters by the highest Allied national authorities for the restoration of personal or governmental property, diplomatic embarrassments might well have resulted were the representations rebuffed. Yet MFAA Officers could not abandon their duties in order to inventory and transport such property. Because of the urgency of MFAA requirements in the field, no major restitutions were made until after the cessation of hostilities.

SECTION 2

THE OFFICIAL LISTS AND THEIR DISADVANTAGES

43. Restrictive Character of the Official Lists.

a. The Official Lists of Monuments for liberated and occupied countries became as much a source of trouble as convenience to MFAA Officers. The very fact that a command authority was embodied in these lists worked to a disadvantage. It was tacitly assumed by both tactical and administrative higher authorities that their responsibilities toward monuments, fine arts, and archives ended with the items included. The original purpose of the lists was to act as a guide, rather than to define irrevocably the monuments to be accorded extra consideration. Authorities were extremely reluctant to order evacuation of buildings not on the Official Lists, even though these structures might be superior to others officially protected.

b. With the commencement of the Ardennes Counter-Offensive, on 16 December 1944, the deficiencies of the Belgian list were thrown into strong relief.³⁸

44. Counteractive Measures Taken.

a. To counteract the situation, the MFAA Officers, First US Army, drew up a command letter and form for the exemption of buildings from military use, which was approved and published by Hq First US Army, 4 February 1945.³⁹

b. The text of the form letter⁴⁰ to be provided owners or guardians of historic/artistic monuments follows:

"(1) Notice is given that the property described below has been designated a Protected Monument.

"(2) This property and/or contents thereof is of such artistic or historic importance that it will not be requisitioned, occupied, entered, or used, in whole or in part, in any way, by military personnel, except in cases of greatest urgency, and then only with the written permission of Army, Corps, or Division Commanders.

"(3) The description below will be authenticated by the signature of one of the duly designated Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Specialist Officers attached to this headquarters, and approved by the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-5, this headquarters."

c. Though this innovation conferred a much needed discretionary authority upon the MFAA Officers within a single army area, and was sufficient for the emergency prevention of damage and emergency accommodation of troops, in applying to one army area only it became invalid so soon as that area was transferred to a different command authority. In order to supplement the Official Lists for Belgium and the Netherlands, SHAEF issued on 20 February 1945 two additional lists of buildings for these countries. The list for Belgium⁴¹ was furnished by the Ministre de l'Instruction Publique, that for the Netherlands⁴² by various Dutch civilian authorities.

d. A command form letter similar to that of the First US Army was issued by the Fifteenth US Army 8 April 1945.⁴³ On 15 April 1945, in order to avoid the necessity of reposting monuments

in an area which had been occupied by five other major commands, Hq Fifteenth US Army issued a letter,⁴⁴ the only one of its kind issued during the European campaign by any major headquarters, which provided that all "Off Limits" signs, "Notices of Designation as Protected Monuments", or other protective measures taken in regard to historic/artistic monuments by authorized personnel of other Allied armies, would be respected and obeyed by all military personnel within the area of the Fifteenth US Army, unless specifically removed or rescinded by Army, Corps, or Division Commanders, or the MEAA Officer, that headquarters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PART TWO

1. "Report on the Status of Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives in the European Theater of Operations," by Col Henry C. Newton, Inf, 20 December 1944. (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, O&G, USFET, Folder 751 - Correspondence, Col Newton).
2. Letter, Subj: "Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Operations in Twelfth Army Group", to AC of S, G-5, 12 AGp, from Col Henry C. Newton, Inf, 25 Nov 1944 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, O&G, USFET, Folder 751 - Correspondence, Col Newton).
3. Unnumbered Staff Memorandum, Subj: "Staff Responsibilities for Civil Affairs", Hq 15th US Army, 18 April 1945.
4. Memorandum to All Chiefs, General and Special Staff Sections, Subj: "Staff Responsibilities for Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives", Hq 15th US Army, 30 April 1945.
5. "Technical Instructions for IFAA Officers in the Field", SHAEF, G-5, (Ops) (undated).
6. Letter, Subj: "Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives, Overall Report for December", from G-5 Sec, Hq ComZ, ETOUSA, to AC of S, G-5, SHAEF, 2 January 1945 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, O&G, USFET, Folder ComZ Reports, 6b).
7. Cf Note 1 above.
8. Report on IFAA for January and February, from AC of S, G-5, Hq ComZ, ETOUSA, to AC of S, G-5, SHAEF, 1 March 1945 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, O&G, USFET, Folder ComZ Reports, 6b).
9. IFAA Interim Report, Area of 1st US Army, from Capt Walker K. Hancock, G-5 Sec, Hq 1st US Army, 24 April 1945 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, O&G, USFET, Folder 1st US Army Reports, B.).
10. Semi-Monthly Report on IFAA for Period Ending 14 January 1945, from Capt Robert K. Posey, G-5 Sec, Hq 3rd US Army, 15 January 1945 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, O&G, USFET, Folder 3rd US Army Reports, 2).
11. "Special Report on Repository of Works of Art in The Netherlands, St. Pietersberg near Maastricht", from Lt George L. Stout, USMR, and S/Ldr J.E. Dixon-Spain, I-5 Sec, Hq 1st US Army, 20 September 1944 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, O&G, USFET, Folder 1st US Army Reports, 2).
12. IFAA Semi-Monthly Report, Area of 1st US Army, 16 April 1945, from Capt Walker K. Hancock, Hq 1st US Army (Personal file of Capt Walker K. Hancock, Det G-39, 2d IG Bn, APO 758, US Army).
13. Special Report, "Chance Find of Indo Repository at Bernterode, Germany", to AC of S, G-5, Hq 12th AGp, from Capt Walker K. Hancock, Hq 1st US Army, 12 May 1945 (Personal file of Capt Walker K. Hancock, Det G-39, 2d IG Bn, APO 758, US Army).
14. "Report covering the discovery, removal, transporting and storage of gold, silver, platinum and currency, fine art treasures and

German patent records from salt mines in the Herkers and Heringen area to the Frankfurt area in Germany", from Lt Col Carl L. Morris, GSC, to Maj Gen Robert W. Crawford, AG of S, G-4, SHAEF, SHAEF, G-4 Div, 26 April 1945 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, OIG, USFET, Folder 751/1/1(REP)-Reports: Special).

15. Semi-Monthly Report on IFAA for Period Ending 15 April 1945, from Capt Robert K. Posey, G-5 Sec, Hq 3rd US Army, 17 April 1945 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, OIG, USFET, Folder, 3rd US Army Reports, 2).
16. Monthly Report on IFAA from Hq 12th AGp (000.4(G-5-34)), to SCALF, 17 May 1945 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, OIG, USFET, Folder 12th AGp Reports).
17. IFAA Final Report, Area of First US Army, 15 May 1945, from Capt Walker K. Hancock, (Personal file of Capt Walker K. Hancock, IG Det G-39, 2d IG Bn, APO 758, US Army).
18. Cf Note 17, above.
19. Memorandum, Subj: "Policy Regarding the Movement and Cataloguing of Archives and Works of Art at Ehrenbreitstein", to C of S, from AG of S, G-5, Hq 15 US Army, 26 May 1945 (AG Record Files, Hq 15th US Army).
20. Letter, Subj: "Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Operations in Twelfth Army Group", to AG of S, G-5, Hq 12th AGp, from Col Henry C. Newton, 25 November 1944 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, OIG, USFET, Folder 751 (Col Newton) - Correspondence: Col Newton).
21. Cf Note 1, above.
22. Cf Note 1, above.
23. List of Fine Arts and Archival Personnel of Germany, November 1944, IFAA Branch, CCG (Br E1), 27 Nov 1944 (INR/62835/IFAA); List of Fine Arts and Archival Personnel of Germany, Geographically Arranged, IFAA Branch, CCG (Br E1), undated; "The Einsatzstab Rosenberg", IFAA Branch, CCG (Br E1), 30 March 1945 (INR/62922/IFAA); "White List of German Personnel", IFAA Branch, CCG, (Br E1), December 1944.
24. Cir. No. 5, "Posting of Notices on Monuments, Collections, and Archives", Hq 12th AGp, 7 February 1945.
25. Demi-Official Letter from Capt Louis B. LaFarge, SHAEF Mission (Belgium), to the Adviser, IFAA, G-5 SHAEF (SIE/G-5/1511), Subj: "Protected Monuments", 16 January 1945. (Personal file of Maj Louis B. LaFarge, IFAA, RD&R Div, OIG, USFET).
26. IFAA Semi-Monthly Report, Area of 1st US Army, 16 January 1945, from Capt Walker K. Hancock and Capt Everett P. Lesley, Jr., G-5 Sec, Hq 1st US Army (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, OIG, USFET, Folder 1st US Army Reports).
27. Memorandum to AG of S, G-5, Hq ADSEC ComZ, Subj: "Notes from Diary about Mont Saint Michel (18-19 August 1944)", from Lt James J. Rorimer, G-5 Sec, Hq ADSEC ComZ, ETOUS. (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, OIG, USFET, Folder ComZ Reports, 6a), and Memorandum, Subj: "Troops Billeted in the Chateau of Dampierre", to AG of S, G-5, Hq Seine Sec, ComZ, ETOUS, from Lt James J. Rorimer, Sept 1944 (IFAA Files, RD&R Div, OIG, USFET, Folder ComZ Reports, 6a).

28. Memorandum, Subj: "Occupation of National Domain at Rambouillet by American Troops", from Lt James J. Rorimer to AG of S, G-5, Hq Seine Sec, ComZ, ETOUSA, 10 October 1944 (FAA Files, RDR Div, OIG, USFET, Folder ComZ Reports, 6a).
29. Memorandum, Subj: "Looting in the Folie St. James, Villa Madrid, Paris", from Lt James J. Rorimer to Lt Col Hamilton, G-5 Sec, Hq Seine Base, ComZ, ETOUSA, 5 February 1945 (FAA Files, RDR Div, OIG, USFET, Folder ComZ Reports).
30. Letter, Subj: "Preservation of Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives" (AG OIA.1 GpGE), Hq ComZ ETOUSA, 1 October 1944.
31. Letter, Subj: "Preservation of Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives" (AG OIA.1 (G-5)), Hq Oise Sec, ComZ, ETOUSA, 28 October 1944.
32. Letter, Subj: "Use of Buildings, Their Contents and Other Property by Military Personnel" (AG 007 GpGE), Hq ETOUSA, 14 November 1944.
33. Memorandum, Subj: "Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives, ComZ, ETOUSA, during November", to AG of S, G-5, SHAEP, from AG of S, G-5, Hq ComZ, ETOUSA, 9 December 1944 (FAA Files, RDR Div, OIG, USFET, Folder ComZ Reports, 6b).
34. Fortnightly FAA Report, 3-17 December 1944, from Capt Walter J. Huchthausen, G-5 Sec, Hq 9th US Army (319.11-GNDT-4), 3 January 1945 (FAA Files, RDR Div, OIG, USFET, Folder 9th US Army Reports, 4).
35. Letter, Subj: "Preservation of Historic Buildings and Monuments", (AG 007 GpGE), Hq ADSEC ComZ, 25 January 1945.
36. Letter, Subj: "Occupation of Chateaux by Allied Armies", (AG 007 GpGE), Hq ComZ ETOUSA, 29 January 1945.
37. FAA Semi-Monthly Report, Area of 1st US Army, from Capt Walter K. Hancock, G-5 Sec, Hq 1st US Army, 1 March 1945 (FAA Files, RDR Div, OIG, USFET, Folder 1st US Army Reports, 1), and FAA Report from Lt Roger A. Clarke, G-5 Sec, Hq Oise Sec, ComZ, 14 March 1945 (FAA Files, RDR Div, OIG, USFET, Folder ComZ Reports).
38. FAA Semi-Monthly Report, Area of 1st US Army, from Capt Walter K. Hancock and Capt Everett P. Lesley, Jr., G-5 Sec, Hq 1st US Army, 1 February 1945 (FAA Files, RDR Div, OIG, USFET, Folder 1st US Army Reports, 3).
39. Letter, Subj: "Protection of Historic/Artistic Monuments" (AG 007 (2)), Hq 1st US Army, 4 February 1945.
40. Incl 1 to Ltr, note 37, above.
41. Letter, Subj: "List of Belgian Chateaux Furnished by Ministre de L'Instruction Publique", (AG 000.4-2 GDS-AG), SHAEP, 20 Feb 1945.
42. Letter, Subj: "List of Belgian Chateaux Furnished by Netherlands Authorities", (AG 000.4-2 GDS-AG), SHAEP, 20 February 1945.

43. Letter, Subj: "Protection of Historic/Artistic Monuments and Archives", (AG 336 G.I.D.E), Hq 15th US Army, 3 April 1945.

44. Letter, Subj: "Protection of Historic/Artistic Monuments" (AG 336 G.I.D.E), Hq 15th US Army, 13 April 1945.

PART THREE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 1

CONCLUSIONS

IT IS CONCLUDED THAT:

45. Planning by Civilian Agencies.

a. The planning by civilian agencies, though begun relatively late when compared to the remainder of planning for the European campaign, was successful and useful except for the lack of definition regarding the actual duties of the IFAA Officer. The limitation of the IFAA Officer to an advisory capacity without providing an adequate operational agency, detached him from the usual means of working effectively within the military establishment and handicapped the IFAA program.

b. The publications undertaken by civilian agencies were of considerable use to IFAA Officers in the field, though duplication of these publications by both military and civilian agencies for basically the same purpose impaired their utility.

46. Planning by Military Agencies.

a. The planning by military agencies was undertaken too late, and with too few personnel, to be effectively integrated with the overall operational plans. Planning would have been more efficacious if undertaken earlier by experienced officers. Several IFAA functions could have been incorporated to advantage in the duties of other staff sections.

b. Operational exigencies were, on the whole, correctly envisaged, but the provision of means for meeting these exigencies was not objective. Personnel, transportation, and specialized equipment needs, while foreseen from the experience gained in Italy, were not adequately met. Tables of Organization and Equipment were not provided.

c. A more courageous and cooperative approach should have been made to the Air Forces. It is probable that the Air Forces would have been able to prevent inestimable destruction if the IFAA program had been properly presented to them.

47. Policy.

a. The overall policy in regard to Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives was both feasible of application and worthy of the best traditions of the Allied Forces.

b. The interpretation of the policy was not materially changed by commanders to whom responsibilities were later delegated.

c. Policy regarding looted works of art, while not a substantial problem during hostilities, was poorly coordinated with the policy regarding blocking and control of property.

48. Personnel Procurement and Deployment.

a. On the whole, the MFA Officers active during operations performed their duties with commendable resourcefulness and stability.

b. The greatest deficiency in some of the personnel assigned or attached to the MFA organization was a lack of:

- (1) Sufficient military training, including staff procedure.
- (2) An aggressive approach to the MFA program within the military establishment.

c. Knowledge of the fine arts, as such, as proved on the whole to be not entirely necessary to MFA Officers. Those with architectural training and Engineer experience were perhaps best equipped to operate in the field. Combat training, and the stamina to meet grueling conditions in the field, while not essential, would have aided in the accomplishment of the MFA mission in forward areas.

d. The policy of procuring personnel through civilian agencies was successful insofar as it called attention to certain officers who had civilian qualifications, though it failed to realize the essential combination of military and professional background.

e. Commissioning of enlisted personnel was a definite success. Enlisted men, by the time they achieved their commissions, were sufficiently trained in military procedures and had lost none of their civilian qualifications.

f. Deployment of personnel through the agency of the European Civil Affairs Division was a mistake.

49. Staff Procedure and Organization.

a. MFA Officers should have been provided with a means of carrying out the policy of the Supreme Commander which was consistent and authoritative for all echelons and areas. "Off Limits" notices and letters of exemption of monuments from military use should have been issued by SHAF in the name of the Supreme Commander.

b. Insufficient rank among MFA Officers was a continuous major difficulty.

50. Supply and Equipment.

a. The supplies of protective and restorative materials necessary for the accomplishment of the MFA mission were completely inadequate.

b. Organizational equipment was completely inadequate.

51. The Official Lists.

a. The Official Lists should have been prepared:

- (1) By officers having a full first-hand knowledge of the monuments themselves.

(2) With the considerations of preventing military occupation or damage by other military means, and the repairing of such damage, fully in mind.

b. MFA Officers were not given sufficient discretionary latitude or authority to act outside the Official Lists. This deficiency should have been remedied.

52. Communication. Means of communication for the dissemination of information and intelligence between MFA Officers at all echelons were impeded by insufficiency of personnel, both staff and operational, and the extent of areas covered.

53. General. The MFA policy, organization, and operations effected during the European campaign should, with necessary revisions, be continued in future planning and operations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT:

54. Policy. The MFAA policy as embodied in the directives of the Supreme Commander be continued as a stated policy of the US Army for future planning and operations.

55. Lists of Monuments. Lists of monuments, objects and collections of cultural, artistic, historic, or archaeological value in possible Theaters of Operations be compiled, kept up to date, and prepared for publication at the appropriate time by the War Department.

56. Assignment of Responsibilities. Assignment be made to appropriate General and Special Staff Sections, in official manuals and War Department publications, of the following responsibilities regarding Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives:

a. Prevention of billeting in or military use of such structures, collections, or institutions as may be designated Protected Monuments.

b. Procurement of US Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives personnel and assignment thereof to such Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives organizations as may be constituted within the military establishment.

c. Compilation, evaluation, and distribution of intelligence information regarding the location of such Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives as have been displaced from their normal repositories, and the Allied or enemy personnel responsible therefor.

d. Provision, consistent with established priorities, of troops or personnel for the military safeguard of Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives, when such safeguard is deemed necessary in the opinion of the commander.

e. Estimate, procurement, and supply of materials necessary for the protection of Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives, and technical assistance required for their repair and the prevention of their deterioration consequent upon the process of war.

57. Archives. Appropriate staff sections of the War Department initiate a coordinated program, to be embodied in an official War Department publication, for the protection and exploitation of such collections of documents or archives as may concern the military establishment.

58. Future MFAA Organization.

a. Further consideration be given by the War Department to Tables of Organization and Equipment for Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives in future operations and planning.

b. Tables of Organization and Equipment, based upon the experience of the Italian and European campaigns, include,

as a separate Branch under G-5, the following minimum allotment of ~~MPAA~~ officers and enlisted men, not including drivers:

(1) Theater Headquarters:

Officers	EM
1 Colonel	1 Chief Clerk (Grade 2)
1 Lt Colonel or Major	2 Stenographers (Grade 3)
1 Captain	2 Clerk-Typists (Grade 4)
	1 Draftsman (Grade 4)

(2) Army Group Headquarters:

Officers	EM
1 Lt Colonel	1 Chief Clerk (Grade 2)
1 Major	2 Stenographers (Grade 3)
1 Captain	2 Clerk-Typists (Grade 4)
	1 Draftsman (Grade 4)

(3) Army Headquarters

Officers	EM
1 Major	1 Chief Clerk (Grade 3)
1 Captain	1 Stenographer (Grade 4)
1 1st Lieutenant	1 Clerk-Typist (Grade 5)
	1 Draftsman (Grade 5)

(4) Equipment include adequate transportation, photographic and technical equipment.

c. Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Detachments be organized, trained and equipped for attachment to the Civil Affairs/Military Government organization (regimental or battalion).

(1) Composition:

Officers	EM
1 Major	1 Chief Clerk (Grade 3)
1 Captain	2 Stenographers (Grade 4)
1 Lieutenant	1 Clerk-Typist (Grade 5)
	1 Draftsman (Grade 5)

(2) Equipment:

Equipment include adequate transportation, photographic, drafting, and technical equipment.